DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 006 SP 020 219

AUTHOR Egan, Kathleen Batato
TITLE Carol, Laurie, and Rita: Three Persons in the Act of Becoming Teachers.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 82
GRANT NIE-G-81-0009
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; *Individual Characteristics; *Individual Differences; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; Student Teaching; *Teacher Background; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *Student Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper portrays three student teachers, in the same teacher education program, who were placed in a highly structured school for their field experience. The study focuses on how individual student teachers develop perspectives toward teaching and interpret school experiences. Individual case histories are presented, based on interviews with the student teachers and their cooperating and supervising teachers, questionnaires, and classroom observations conducted over a five-month period. Factors other than setting and personality--specific events and people--influenced student teachers' views. Although actions of the three student teachers were similar at times, due to school-designed practices, the student teachers developed divergent perspectives based on their unique perceptions. Comparisons and analyses are made, and implications for teacher education are discussed. (Author/FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216006

CAROL, LAURIE, AND RITA: THREE PERSONS IN THE ACT OF BECOMING TEACHERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathleen Batato Egan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Kathleen Batato Egan

University of Wisconsin-Madison

School of Nursing

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York

March, 1982

The data for this paper were collected in 1981 as part of a research funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

SP 020 219

ABSTRACT

This paper portrays three young women who followed the same teacher education program and were placed in one highly structured school. The study focuses on how individual student teachers develop perspectives towards teaching, giving meaning and interpreting school experiences. The cases were constructed based on surveys, interviews, and classroom observations. Factors other than the setting and personality were found to influence and shape student teachers' views. Though actions were similar at times due to school designed practices, the students gave different meaning to their practice and developed divergent perspectives. The paper stresses the uniqueness and value of each experience to understand the making of a teacher, and concludes with lessons to be learned for teacher education programs.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to portray three young women who followed the same teacher education program and how they constructed their views towards teaching. Each of these three students were placed in one highly structured IGE (Individually Guided Education) school. This study focuses on these three student-teacher's attempts to develop meaning and personal interpretations about teaching for common school experiences. The individuals were faced with similar occupational rules and structures, but had different experiences and stories to tell. Although the book cover was the same, the stories were different.

This paper attempts to understand the personal interpretations and synthesis that these students were making of teaching perspectives. The teacher socialization literature is mainly concerned with adoption of occupational norms and beliefs and in some ways ignores another important aspect of teaching development, namely, the emerging of an individual in a traditional institution such as school (Meyer & Rowan, 1978). The problem, as we see it, is not if college or school's impact is stronger or whether they are allied in perpetuating traditional roles (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981), but what are the experiences, and the processes of growth. What does each case tell us about personal ways of internalizing, assimilating, and actualizing varied biographical and contextual experiences? What is the personal synthesis, if any, that students would make?

The image of going back home is helpful when looking at student teaching. When going home, mixed and opposite feelings may

appear. There is at times a sense of the familiar and at times a feeling of the unknown. Generation gaps and new perspectives are interwoven with the sense of belonging and yet of being different. The son or daughter is no longer a child and wants to be treated as an adult. There is acquiescence and yet rebellion, questioning and acceptance. The image of coming back home seems to be tacitly present in many of the student-teachers' experiences during their practicum in schools. They know the institution from thousands of hours as students themselves. Things look familiar, the "mis en scène" has not changed very much: desks, tables, blackboards, books, grades, and homework are still a great part of the act. The main difference is in the role to be played: the teaching role. It is this role and its formation: the becoming a teacher which is studied, the official and public teaching role. Being a teacher and being recognized as such in the student-teaching experience is problematic. The questions often asked are: How do students become teachers? How do they socialize in the role? What and where are the sources of influence? Do students develop a teaching perspective? Are their beliefs and actions congruent during their student-teaching experience?

Educators and researchers have debated the source of influences in the student-teaching experience. Is it the organizational and institutional structure where students receive training--university and schools--or is it the biographical and personality factors which every student comes with into a program? The answers to the questions are different in the literature. Three views prevail-- 1) the ecological

context view - Doyle and Ponder (1975), Copeland (1980); 2) the psychological context view - Lortie (1975), and Wright and Tuska (1968); and 3) the interactive view - Lacey (1977), and Zeichner and Grant (1981)--where both psychology and social structure are intertwined in teachers' development.

The ecological view sees both cooperating teachers and students caught by the constraints of the social structure within which they work: school bureaucracy, occupational rules, institutional norms, "a network of interconnected processes and events which impinges upon behavior in the teaching environment" (Doyle and Ponder, 1975, p. 183). This is a view that looks at teachers and student teachers as perpetuating existing routines and maintaining the school's status quo.

The psychological context view emphasizes the role of biography and personal disposition as major factors in teachers' development. Lortie (1975) even questions the term socialization as appropriate in describing the entry into the teaching role. Formal training is seen as tangential to role configuration.

The interactive view set forth by Lacey (1977) and supported by Zeichner and Grant (1980) points to the importance of looking at the influence of biography on socialization outcomes. Student teachers play an active part in internalizing the role. They come into the profession with a set of beliefs and an orientation that belong to their personal makeup and the broader social culture within which they operate and function.

The literature (as reviewed by Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981)), has also dealt with which impact is stronger on student-teachers'

development--the university or the schools. The commonly accepted view is of the liberal impact of professional education and the gradual shift towards more conservative and traditional views of schooling. This common belief has not been corroborated in research as there were two main erroneous assumptions: one, that all students go into student teaching with liberal ideas and two, that all practicing teachers have traditional views. Zeichner and Grant (1980) found that many students start their student-teaching practicum with more custodial views toward pupil control than their cooperating teachers. Others like Iannacone and Britton (1964) suggest that students are in a transitional period, characterized by ambivalent feelings, insecurities, and contraditions. Tabachnick, Popkewitz, and Zeichner (1979-80) confirm this characterization, seeing students accomodating to two institutions: university and public schools. Fox (1977) looks at the issue a little differently by pointing out how the teacher education programs do not immerse the students in either culture: schools or university. The stipulation is that these two settings offer different dynamics and the synthesis is not "rational, gradual or even developmental," but rather "a process that is divergent, abrupt and unpredictable" (p. 29). Moreover, "it is the synthesis of these two dynamic cultures that will define all programs and the development of all student teachers."

Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981, p. 10) see schools and universities as partners in the development of traditional teaching perspectives, encouraging acquiescence and conformity to existing school routines. The individual is seen as powerless when faced with institutional

constraints, an "illusion, disillusion, reality conflict" takes place (Tabachnick, 1980). The larger social forces, outside of schools and university classrooms bear a large impact on teachers' development (Zeichner and Grant, 1981). Many complex factors are at play in teachers' development and the interplay of these various variables is the unknown.

The other important issue is related to teachers' perspectives. As defined by Hammersley (1977) perspectives are the way in which teachers think about their work and what meanings they give to their actions in the classroom. Related to this second issue of perspective is the question of whether that interplay between thinking and action, theory and practice is typical of student teachers. Berlak and Berlak (1981) look at the problem in terms of dilemmas with which all teachers are faced. Elliot (1979) sees all teachers learning and changing with experiences. Reforms and changes in schools have often emerged from within, e.g., open classrooms, teacher centers. The external reforms based on experimental or theoretical models have often had no impact on schools as implementation strategies often did not include teachers as authors and/or collaborators in the endeavor. Recent collaborative research (Elliot, 1979) emphasizes the key element of involving teachers in the formulation of projects and in the process and implementation phases if any success or changes are to be expected. The inservice literature points to the same recommendation of involving teachers at all levels of decision-making.

The investigation of student-teachers' perspectives is related to the study of students' capability of reflection. Are students extracting

meaning from their tasks in schools? Reflection, according to Wehlage (1979) is not part of the professional tradition. Feiman (1979) suggests

> There are no standardized procedures for becoming reflective or achieving professional maturity. One develops the habit of reflection in teaching through varied opportunities to study one's practice in the company of reflective people. (p. 8).

This research was seen as an opportunity for student teachers to reflect on their practice and share the sources of influence and existential episodes that had impact on their views.

The study has focused on the individual case and the personal articulation of thought and action when talking about teaching. The interest is in showing how three individuals practicing in the same environment, construct their own learning about the teaching role. Student-teachers' differences in learning, and the impact of the training on student-teachers' perspectives are analyzed. Are these perspectives temporary compromises and/or exploratory attitudes? Are these perspectives outcomes of existential moments--key experiences and events--that impact their views? The portrayals will first answer these questions for three different persons: Carol, Laurie, and Rita, and will then compare and contrast these individual answers in order to arrive at a more general understanding.

METHOD

This research is part of the first phase of a larger field study on the development of teacher perspectives and the relationship between teacher perspectives, classroom and school processes, and student

diversity.(i) Thirteen student teachers were selected on the basis of a questionnaire ("The Teacher Beliefs Inventory") given to all students who were enrolled in the elementary student teaching program at a Midwestern university. The 13 students represented diverse perspectives as well as diverse demographic variables (schools, grades, rural/urban). All of these students had volunteered to participate in the study.

The subjects: The three cases described here--Laurie, Rita, and Carol--were chosen because they were placed in the same highly structured school (IGE: Individually Guided Education) and had different perspectives at the start of the experience. (Tables 1 & 2, pp. 41-42). They formed a distinctive group within the larger study. Rita and Carol were teaching in the same unit of 150 4-5th graders with a team of teachers and Laurie was in the next unit of 150 5-6th graders with another team of teachers. The units were separate although they functioned very similarly. Laurie and Carol were interns, meaning earning wages and given more responsibilities. They were the only interns in the study.

The school and the two units: Individually Guided Education was developed in the sixties, during a period of educational reform and technological development. It was conceived with a system analysis approach to improve cognitive learning (Klausmeier, Rossmiller, and Saily, 1977). The organizational components of the unitized school were to respond to individual differences by allowing a team of teachers to group kids according to abilities and learning media. Every unit, called the Research and Instructional Unit, is staffed by a unit leader, 3-6 certified teachers, paraprofessionals (mainly aides), and community

volunteers (mothers). Of the 3-6 certified teachers, 2--in the case of the units studied here--were students doing their internship and one, her student-teaching experience. The team was responsible for the education of 100 to 200 children from two grade levels.

The school of this study had the main IGE characteristics: large units, a team of teachers, and ability grouping. In both units studied, as in the whole school, the emphasis was on information acquisition and test achievement. Students worked from prepackaged math materials at their own pace (or as fast as they could). The teachers monitored the individual progress and recorded students' test scores. There was very little room for individual teacher input when the content was math or reading as these were preprogrammed and students were graded by standard tests. A great stress was put on evaluation. All curriculum units, even science and social studies, were completed with similar competency tests across the unit.

The structure and the uniformity in roles, teaching methods, and expectations came from the educational assumptions behind the creation of the school. As stated by Popkewitz, Tabachnick, and Wehlage (in press), these assumptions: define knowledge as that which is stated in advance of instruction as behavior objectives and that can be measured by tests, define work that children do as being structured by an instructional program model with sequential activities; and finally, define the role of the professional as the one who implements the program.

Procedure

A field study methodology (naturalistic observation and open-ended interviews) was used to study the development of teacher perspectives

during the 15 week student-teaching experience. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed for content analysis. The documentation of the research was closely organized in Stenhouse's (1978) categorization style: "case data" which is the bulk of materials assembled, "case record" which is the edited version of the case data, "case study" which is an interpretive discussion of the case, and "survey" which is a cumulative comparison of case studies. In the case of this research, the case data and the case record were the same because the data sources were manageable in their original form.

Each student was interviewed six times and observed at least four times during the January-May, 1981 semester. The first interview was conducted along the line of those conducted by Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel (1976) in an attempt to assess the "entering characteristics" of the students (why became teacher, why chose the placement, expectations, typical day activities, conflicts, and interaction with cooperating teacher, supervisor and other colleagues). The remaining interviews dealt with teacher role, student diversity, knowledge and curriculum, teacher-pupil relationships, school and society, and community and parents' role. Although the interviews were scheduled around the themes, questions were asked as related to the observation data, seeking to understand how students "assign meaning to their beliefs by acting on them and how they give meaning to their actions by making interpretative statements about the actions after they have occurred."(2) (p. 13).

A final interview assessed changes experienced and perceived by the student and/or the localization of the sources of change, if any, as well as future teaching plans and expectations.

In addition to the interviews and observational data, each student was asked to keep a log of her experiences. Weekly seminars with supervisor and other student teachers were also attended during the semester. All cooperating teachers and the one supervisor assigned to the three students were also interviewed at the end of the semester and asked to portray the changes, if any, seen in the student and to identify their impact and that of others on students' teaching perspectives. All interviewed were offered back transcripts of interviews and profiles written by the researcher.

The case studies and case survey in this paper are built in the sense offered by Stake (1978) where the

> situation is one in which there is need for generalization about that particular case or generalization to a similar case rather than generalization to a population of cases. Then the demands for typicality and representativeness yield to needs for assurance that the larger case is properly described. As readers recognize essential similarities to cases of interest to them, they establish the basis for naturalistic generalization. (p. 7).

THE CASE STUDIES

Carol came from a rural Midwestern area; both of her parents were farmers. She spent 18 years in her hometown and went 12 years to parochial school and felt good about her past schooling experience. At 24 she was completing her teaching degree. Carol is quiet, discreet, and very pleasant. Her cooperating teacher described her as:

> a good team member, with a pleasing personality, attractively dressed and she sets a good example for the children...she will make an ideal teacher, one of the nicer students. She is independent, willing to try new ideas, and has a mind of her own...* (p. 209).

Her supervisor saw her as fitting perfectly in the unit, and even at times a "carbon copy of her cooperating teacher."

> She just was so impressive, very professional, extremely professional with a high commitment to the team...she just loves children. (p. 219).

Both supervisor and cooperating teacher agreed in their basic descriptions of Carol, although the cooperating teacher saw more independence in Carol than the supervisor did.

The team demanded firmness and strict control in discipline. Carol changed in that respect but in the opposite direction of the school's demands. She came into the experience with "humanistic teacher-pupil relationship perspective" and came out with a higher score (see Tables 1 and 2). The real Carol was not very well known. The supervisor saw agreement between Carol's thinking and action: I think her beliefs are very close to what it was she was doing." Carol is seen as someone who doesn't question or criticize things: "I rarely heard her say anything negative about anything." It is partially true. Carol described herself as not rocking the boat.

> I'm one to follow rules. I'm not one to be the first one to question someone. I'll think it through and I'll just try it; I'll follow the rule for awhile...unless it is too harsh for the kids. (pp. 191-192).

---

* The quotations from the case data have not been edited. Verbatim transcribing was preferred. Incomplete sentences, grammatical errors, pauses, and abrupt transitions are common in most people's oral communications.

In her responses to the Teacher's Belief Inventory in May (see Table 2), Carol shows definitely a change towards a critical view (item 28 and item 50). Carol was not a conformist, as she may have appeared. Carol explained her behavior at the school as contingent to the situation.

> Because of the situation I'm in here, I pretty much follow the schedule that they have set up for me...I don't know if I would do that in my class; here I follow a pattern of behavior set up for me. (p. 190).

The real Carol was not fully revealed to either cooperating teacher or supervisor. Carol did almost everything the team asked her to do, but she did not feel good about it when it interfered with what she saw as her right:

> Those are my kids and that's how I want to take care of them... (p. 153).

Carol was seen as fitting perfectly in the school and she really did. She adjusted to the school, never criticized any of it openly, except when it had to do with kids. Of the six themes discussed, student diversity or talking about her class was the most interesting to her. At the end of the interview she exclaimed: "Oh, this was a real fun thing to think about!" The kids are her most cherished topic:

> It is something that I can look at and say, this is what I have done with these students. I've been working with them and I can say something about it, whereas thinking about what I could do and I haven't done... (p. 119).

She was referring to the previous interviews relating to teacher role, knowledge, and curriculum. Teaching for Carol was to make it interesting for kids:

> Before I had said I wanted to be their friend. I want them to like me but more than that, I want to find something that interests them. (p. 131).

Carol's affiliation was to the children and the community rather than the school. During her internship, she was struggling with her natural tendency to adjust, be flexible and learn from others while at the same time she wanted to be consistent with her personal beliefs.

Carol did not want to intrude into someone else's territory.

> I'll sit in, right now, and follow along their plan, do my own kind of things in my classroom, if I want to kid around a little bit with the kids, that's my personality, that's something that I'll just do. (p. 141).

She followed the rules, but just for awhile, because when challenged about personal values in teaching and school district curriculum's regulations she took a stand:

> I think my personal teaching beliefs could take over and explain what I really believed in.

About curriculum:

> Fulfilling my obligations as best as I can, and still following my instincts and the children's interests. (p. 142).

Carol behaved as someone working for someone else. She effaced herself a lot in her teaching. She had a mind of her own, but did not go much astray in open ways. Carol looked at the school as a place where she learned practicalities and techniques. The open setting is seen as a challenge, enabling her to adjust to any setting: close-open, traditional or informal. Two things stand out in Carol's experience: her fondness for kids and her affiliation with the community. She would like to teach in a rural school. She wanted to be an active member of the community, knowing families and kids:

> I would like to see the kids not only in school but strolling around, skating down the street or playing baseball in the park...I mean I would like a relationship like that with kids, I don't just want to be a teacher in school... (p. 195).

Carol came into the internship because she wanted the fullest experience to enable her to be a full-fledged teacher. She made it a point to be treated and seen as an intern. At parties or at the teachers' lounge, Carol sat at the table with teachers rather than with other fellow students. There was a gentle and firm seriousness about her and the role she was enacting.

When asked about incidents, people who influenced her into teaching and had impact on her views, Carol was very emotional and grateful. Her fourth grade teacher stands out (she wants to get in touch with her and let her know).

> I remember one specific incident, I was sick or something and she took me down to the office. I had a scratch on my eye, and it was that she <u>took the time</u> to leave the class...Did you know that that one incident made me go into education. (p. 3).

Of all the existential moments that transformed Carol, her interactions with kids were the most influential. She was amazed at how well she knew them, the hundred and mostly her homeroom the thirty 4-5th graders. In her words, they were the ones with most influence, the kids, they changed her views and her role:

> When I first came I thought I could do a lot for kids somehow. I thought that I could explain things to them but now that I've actually had a chance to talk to the kids and listen to them, go through everyday with them, I see how much I can do for them by pointing out a few things but also I see a lot more of how much their family is teaching them and how much their experiences that they have on vacation, on a weekend when they went fishing or something, how much that is teaching them and as a teacher, I can point out things related to that. (pp. 123-129).

Carol did not see her cooperating teacher or supervisor as strong influences. She was very grateful for the opportunities given, management cues and techniques learned, but did not like the constant reminder of controlling kids. Carol was excited about learning herself. She mentioned enjoying a friend's explanation of how cars functioned. "He did it in a simple manner and I could understand and do something with it." And that is the way she wanted to teach: explaining clearly and simply, making sure the kids and each individual understood. These instances were more powerful to her than the cooperating teacher or supervisor when it came to her view of knowledge and curriculum, teacher role and teacher-pupil relationship.

Carol did not see herself changing much through the experience. She saw herself coming into the profession with a lot of beliefs that she still keeps. The changes are more of a practical order rather than ideological.

As to her views, these have evolved with her as she grew up. Carol acknowledged with enthusiasm the university's impact. Coming from a rural area and having spent 12 years in a parochial school, Carol saw the university as having a great impact as it was her first time away from home. Carol acknowledged with enthusiasm the university's impact:

> I've learned a lot from college. It exposed me to so many new avenues relating to education specifically, but so many other things too that it brought about that I didn't know. I never even thought about...but now I think about things a lot more. I read things, I research a little bit. It has added a real curiosity to me about everything. (p. 163).

The university did not necessarily mean the formal teacher education program. It was more the new culture, the new environment with a different group of people to be with compared to her hometown. It was not the ideas learned that had the impact, but rather the whole setting and style of life. In fact, she criticized the radicalism and lack of accuracy in some of the courses offered.

> They took statistics too dramatically, and when you go to the schools, nothing stands out as black and white, as the university says. (p. 164).

Finally, her involvement in this research project was very important to Carol. It had an impact on her thinking, it offered her opportunities for reevaluating her actions, examining new questions, and looking ahead for more reflective thought in the act of becoming a teacher:

> The questions were too hard for me, because I hadn't had enough experience to really evaluate what I was doing. The questions you've asked me I probably couldn't answer them so I thought them through. I really did. I did make an effort of it and I did write it down and made an assignment for myself but I was really curious as to how I felt...I don't think it has changed my teaching and what I believe in but it has helped as a teacher...just to evaluate my position as a professional within society. The questions you've asked I really thought through and then I was sure that, yes, that is how I believe, and, yes, that's how I got my encouragement from and then there was still some questions that I'm foggy on so that that's just something that probably won't come to me until I've had more experiences. (pp. 176-177).

Laurie came from a little town in northern Wisconsin. She went both to parochial and public school. Laurie is tall and athletic, outgoing and outspoken. At 27, she was completing her teaching degree

with many conflicts. Her former 6th grade teacher, who is now a personal friend, supported her choice of going into teaching, but was warning her at the same time as Laurie recalled in her comment:

> You are very energetic; you'd be very good at teaching, but you need to bring your ideas down to reality. (p. 114).

She first went into Medtech because she liked the sciences but found that she did not like the lack of human interaction. While going to college, she was interested in kids and worked with them in different settings. Her experience with severely handicapped kids led her into the teaching profession, but not into special education as she became interested in the so-called "average child."

> It just seemed like there are special students always, but there's the average child to me is more special because they're caught in the flow. They're average, everybody thinks they're average, and they're just floating along. (p. 2).

Laurie came into teaching wanting to blend her love for kids and her interest in science.

> I would like to combine the two, teaching and science...our body is a walking laboratory and the kids are fascinated by this stuff. (p. 6).

She was enthusiastic and eager to try out her ideas in schools. Laurie was not afraid to teach, to face the challenge of teaching, but she experienced disapproval and failure:

> I was not afraid to come back and teach. I mean, I was looking forward to it. And I talked to other people and they were afraid to come here, and I wasn't. I was really into it. Life is hard, but I felt sure of myself as a teacher or that I could do it. And I got here and it was like, yes, I fell flat on my face. (p. 24).

Laurie wanted to try new things but:

> ...they really put a lid on things I wanted to do...(p. 25).

She and her cooperating teacher did not see eye to eye. They knew their differences. The cooperating teacher saw Laurie as coming in

> with a lot of fresh, creative ideas, extremely idealistic, had a lot of theory and little practical experience. She likes the idea of working with kids and therefore wants the kids to like her, and when she said she fell flat on her face, she did. She allowed them to think of her as their buddy and in doing that, that's what they thought of her.

The main difference was in their views of how to discipline and relate to kids. The cooperating teacher believed in structure and firm discipline--"we can no longer baby them." Laurie resented the cooperating teacher's attitudes and airs with team members:

> ...since she got the position of unit leader, that made her feel superior to all of us. (p. 133).

as well as her relationship with kids

> She was wearing blinders...I guess this is what I really didn't like. The kids I enjoyed working with, the low group, the problems, she always put them down. And that bugged me. You can't do that. It was like, the upper ability kids, the ones that were high ability, the one she had baby sit for her child, she was nice to...(p. 134).

They both acknowledged their differences but were unwilling to talk about them to each other. Laurie was in a dependent situation needing approval, and recommendation for certification and teaching jobs. She adjusted to the situation. The cooperating teacher saw the effort but was aware of its superficiality.

> I don't think she believed half of the things I was telling her. She came filled with these fantasy ideas of what teaching was all about. She wasn't ready for the real world to hit her (p. 97)...she did (change) to satisfy my requirements and supervisor's. Laurie has the tendency to spout back what she thinks you want to hear. That's why I'm not sure she believes this stuff she tells me or if she is doing it because it is part of the job. (p. 98).

Cooperating teacher and supervisor agreed in their perceptions of Laurie. Both saw a lack of confidence:

> (Supervisor): She was very confident, in an outward way, but insecure inside...she wanted to approach things very innovatively, very much on a friend basis, almost a peer association with the students. (p. 79).

> (Cooperating teacher): She comes off as very confident but I guess underneath she isn't as confident as she comes off. That is not a side that I have seen but I have been told by a member of my team. (p. 100).

Laurie saw the two--cooperating teacher and supervisor--as setting her up for failure. None of them supported her at the beginning of the semester when she was trying to be innovative. They questioned her ability to become a teacher:

> That question came up a lot. 'Laurie, do you think that you should be in education? Do you think it's the field for you?' And ever since then my feelings about teaching, here anyway, have dropped. I've more or less conformed to the norm. (p. 60).

Laurie's conforming response was appreciated by the cooperating teacher who acknowledged Laurie's improvement in classroom management (p. 91). The supervisor was worried and saw negative aspects in Laurie's reactions and disciplining style. The supervisor saw her becoming strict and hard on kids:

> She was tense, more nervous, more jumpy, the same things that she could have said positively, but she wanted to keep on them and control... (p. 80), (supervisor).

Again, in agreement with the cooperating teacher, the supervisor saw the creativity in Laurie:

> I think she is a fairly creative person as far as ideas and she really wants to involve kids in the learning act...I think she impressed the rest of the team and the students were very involved...I don't think she was totally able to teach the way she would if she had her own class...I think she had a conflict with the cooperating teacher and that I don't think helped at all throughout the semester (p. 82), (supervisor).

Laurie felt that both supervisor and cooperating teacher did not give her the support she needed. The supervisor recognized the fact that Laurie needed that but according to Laurie she did not give it:

> Laurie needed the guidance and feedback and direction at first. She needs to be told that she is doing a good job and needs to be told where to improve. (p. 82), (supervisor).

The internship experience had a great impact on Laurie, not necessarily changing her ideas, but allowing her to reexamine her position and desire to teach. She felt as an outsider in her team: "I see myself different from everybody in the unit..." (p. 66). She also felt that she was not part of the team when it came to decisions:

> I felt just like a ping pong ball. I can get bounced around at anyone's will (Journal, p. 35).

In spite of those feelings and negative experiences, lack of communication, support and freedom, Laurie felt strongly about teaching. The experience did not shatter her desire to go into education or decrease her self-confidence.

> Yes, I am a good teacher. And education is what I want to go into. And I couldn't find another field right now if I had to start all over. I would still pick education...The challenge is there, I really love challenge--100% of the day. There's so many things that are changing. And it's never boring. Education will never, ever be boring. (pp. 76-77).

In her response to the Teacher's Belief Inventory before and after the internship, her perspectives have not changed (see Tables 1 and 2), but this alone would be an unfair statement. Laurie's experience was extremely important, not in changing views as expressed by test scores, but in strengthening attitudes and offering opportunities for reexamining her stand.

When asked about influences and changes during the semester, Laurie mentioned her awareness of political games in schools, lack of cooperation among teachers: "a lot of covering up and sugar coating situations." Her cooperating teacher strengthened her beliefs about children as she disapproved of her relationship with kids. Laurie learned what not to do and what can be damaging to teachers and kids. The conflicts in her experience made her more critical of schools and aware of its bureaucracy, lack of democracy and freedom. The experience made her conform for awhile.

> I compromised. I mean, I didn't compromise. No one else did. I just conformed. And I didn't enjoy that. That wasn't me. (p. 114).

Her conformism was thin; her cooperating teacher, supervisor, and other team members knew that Laurie went by the rules only to a certain extent. Laurie did a few things on her own: she diverged from the math pack twice a week; she set up a newspaper unit, mixing reading ability groups.

These activities were allowed as they did not affect the rest of the team. The kids were upset as Laurie was slowing them down with their packs. However, at the end, they appreciated it and asked for it. She wanted to be appreciated as the teacher who made them work:

> They knew they had to work in my class...but they enjoyed doing it, and they could see that they could get something out of it. Even though Miss X was hard on us but it was in a nice way. (p. 141).

The internship experience was crucial to Laurie, but it would be simplistic to understand the internship as isolated from Laurie's personal life and past experiences. Laurie saw her car accident of two years ago as the major event in her life. The car accident has greatly influenced the way she thinks and acts. It made her aware of the injustices and of the need to question things about her.

> My accident...I got screwed over really bad...I was forced to default...you can't trust society, people can get at you...It made me like you cover every single base, that you look at the whole picture and you look at it from as many angles as you can...I want children to feel free that they ask questions...Don't take it as black and white... that they question and they ask...(pp. 128-129).

The other major event that had impact on her beliefs was leaving her home town, moving out to college. It opened a new way of thinking and an acceptance of other styles of life. (She compared herself with her sister who came to visit her and was shocked with the college style of life, (p. 130)). She saw differences in culture between the university campus and the schools, home, and the larger population. She also saw the university influencing her to be a radical. She felt idealistic and criticized by the school as such. She was concerned about the durability of the effect:

> The university keeps you in a bubble...it's all bleary. And there's no way everything looks good on paper. But to apply this is another question. And the community sees you as you're another radical from the university. And it's like we come out of here very idealistic. I do think that had something to do with my feeling now...and five years from now I may be totally at the other end of the spectrum. I hope not...(p. 136).

Laurie felt that the university made her politically aware while people in the community are not or become "conformist." Laurie worried about being perceived as a college graduate from a liberal school and therefore must believe so and so and is in conflict with the mainstream traditional community.

Laurie thought it was important for teachers to be sent back to college, to take inservice courses with undergraduate students and have a feeling of broadening their views: "have them sit in on methods courses." (p. 137).

Laurie gave great importance to feelings. She was going through her own personal conflict of love and commitment. At the time, she was making the decision to break with one of her two boyfriends. The relationships were intense. These events were important in this case, especially as Laurie was not finding any human support at the school. At the same time, as kids confided in her (pot smoking, divorce, home problems), and were asking for closeness and friendship, the teachers in the unit were encouraging distance and discipline. Teaching to Laurie went beyond the academics, although she put emphasis on the basics and was concerned with her students learning key concepts in math. But she did not want to be the disciplinarian.

> It's not my job to be your police officer, to patrol over you. I said it's my job as your teacher to help you learn. (p. 10).

She remembered her 4th grade teacher who stands out as important in her decision to go into teaching. The same teacher also helped her make the transition from parochial school to public school:

> She had feelings...She didn't come across as like I'm the teacher, I'm right...It was OK that you didn't get 100% on your papers...Once I bummed a spelling test. I felt like, God, I didn't want to show this to anybody. And she said, it's all right. Now you know that you have learned, and you can learn from the ones that are wrong more than you'll ever learn from the ones you get 100% on. And, um, that made me feel good, you know, and I wanted to be like that sometime. (pp. 16-17).

Finally, her involvement in this research project was very important to Laurie. Her talks in the interviews helped her grow in understanding because they enabled her to openly express her concerns. She had been turned down by teachers and questioned her capacity to teach. The research helped her reflect:

> Look back onto things differently...It helps me to look back on the whole situation I had. And it helps me look at, you know, college. It helped me become more aware of what's going to happen out there...There's a lot of angles that I still hadn't looked at, and sometimes I feel that--how am I going to cover all that? In things that I'd like to do, in teaching. And it makes you wonder, though. Every time I come over here I more and more want to go into teaching...From my practicums, just the half days, I feel really confident about them, really good about them. As to my interning, there are some days I really felt bad about myself. I mean I felt I did a really crummy job. And I guess I really sort of questioned myself, because I wanted to go into teaching and I thought I could be good at it. And that made me really sort of question, like maybe I'm not. (p. 143).

In spite of the shattering of confidence and her self-questioning, Laurie ended the last interview with a strong sense of uniqueness.

> Not every teacher is alike. And it's too bad some people think they should be...(p. 114).

Rita was the youngest of the three cases: she was 21 and getting married in the Fall of 1981. She was very proud of her background. Her father was an officer in the army and her mother had a degree in communication arts and she felt very lucky to be born in a well-educated family; she had travelled all over and had lived in many different places.

Rita appeared to have a lot of confidence. She thought highly of herself:

> I am a very flexible person and I get along very well with people and I don't have a lot of conflicts with anybody (referring to cooperating teacher and supervisor). I have an open eye, and I look upon things with a critical eye--not necessarily that I'm always wanting to change it but I want to make sure that it's the best for the student. I have a very good rapport with kids; I'm interested in them, not only their academics but actually what they're made up of: their make up. I'm always interested in developing new ideas or new units or gathering materials that are outside. I'm excited about teaching, I have a very positive attitude about it. I want to do what is best for the child...develop the best curriculum and teaching environment centers with children... (pp. 123-124).

Her supervisor and cooperating teacher were impressed by Rita's confidence and outspokenness in the team situation:

> I perceived her more as a rebel. Somebody who would come in and definitely have their own ideas and would not be very receptive to change...(p. 145), (supervisor).

The supervisor explained Rita's outspokenness and independence from her background and life style.

> She feels that she has had opportunities and that she has a lot to offer other people. She's very confident in her capacities and the fact that she is what she is, and that she has had all these opportunities and she is a rich kid...(p. 147).

The cooperating teacher saw Rita's strengths as critical of curriculum and determined to voice her opinion, but he also saw her fundamentally following school regulations in her behavior. She "fitted" into the school.

> She was very easy to fit into the mold of realizing our discipline structures in the unit, to see how we ran the classrooms, how we set up our curriculum. I think she fit in very well. But, at the same time, I think she also had her own set ideas as to what was relevant to the children. I think relevancy was her key, relevant to the children. She was going within the structures, to try to make her programs as relevant to the children as she could. (p. 137).

It is to be noted that the cooperating teacher was different in views and philosophies than most other teachers in the unit. He wanted to initiate more cooperative skills in his classroom and emphasized less the academics in order to provide time for that. He had lived in Sweden and married a Swedish woman. He was impressed with the Swedish emphasis on cooperation, and thought the American education needed some of that:

> We have all those fights out at recess; we don't deal with how do you relate to your next door neighbor when he takes your pencil, and how to resolve conflicts...I think we have to deal with that and start teaching children how to get along with each other. (p. 138).

He did not apply many of his ideas because he was afraid they would be considered too radical by the community and would not be welcomed.

Rita and her cooperating teacher thought highly of each other. They were both critical of things happening in the unit, although Rita thought that her cooperating teacher was more critical than she was. When asked about her cooperating teacher, Rita gave a very warm and enthusiastic description:

> I'm really enjoying X; he's a different type of person and he's outspoken and kind of a feisty person but yet he's got a lot of good ideas, and he lets me do what I want, and he's very positive and he gets along with his kids...He's not one of these teachers who doesn't want to hear what is wrong. I really enjoy working with him. He's not one of these type of persons that I'm concerned about what I say to him where there are a couple of other people in my unit that I would be less comfortable with. (p. 30).

Compared to the other teachers, her cooperating teacher was more informal in his interactions with kids and was criticized by the rest of the unit as lacking a "firm grip" on the classroom. The cooperating teacher saw the relationship between Rita and him as one of colleagues that learn from each other:

> I tried to treat her as an equal. I tried to give her the freedom that she wanted to develop her curriculum. I was here merely as a sounding board where she shared ideas and at the end of a unit, comments were made...(p. 155).

The freedom given to Rita did not reflect itself in the daily classroom activities. She did things like all the other teachers in the unit, except for a large group presentation on Hawaii where Rita could share something more personal and where she did not feel bound to the curriculum. Rita saw herself and was seen as the student teacher who did a great job in the classroom.

> She had a lot of excellent qualities, management skills. She was able to keep on top of everything and well-planned and so forth...(p. 157).

Rita came into the student teaching experience with high expectations on classroom management. Her first page in her journal said:

> The first day at the school as been mixed with many feelings. Number one is fear, fear of the unknown, fear of failure, and fear of my final phase of the UW teaching program. (pg. 1, Journal).

When asked about expectations, Rita replied:

> The thing I feared most was the area of classroom management. I want to pick up techniques and ways of dealing with kids in many different situations. I'm becoming more and more at ease with the whole idea of discipline...my goal is to start feeling more comfortable with the kids...(p. 17).

Her cooperating teacher agreed with Rita's expectations and perceived that nervousness:

> I think when she came in the beginning she, as all student teacers are, I think they're a little bit nervous, a little bit apprehensive coming into a new situation...The only thing that I remember that stuck out at the time was that her one concern was classroom management. Dealing with the classroom, which usually means disciplining children... But all other areas she seemed to be rather self-confident as far as taking over and dealing with the situation of student teaching. (p. 129).

Rita always wanted to be a teacher. She didn't know if it had been because of "stereotypic" expectations for women to become teachers, or that she was surrounded by educators in her family.

> Most of my relatives are in education, so that may have been another influence...My grandfather was an educator, they are also all UW graduates. All my dad's brothers are educators in Milwaukee; my aunt

> is an educator in secondary ed; my dad's two cousins, one is a principal. I have an uncle who is dean of admissions at the University so he's in the administrative end of education; so all, so basically all my relatives are in education. I think just the atmosphere of being around educators my whole life may have trickled something in my head. My sister is just a freshman in Madison and she's going into education. I think it's probably just my whole family life, but my parents aren't. My dad is a Colonel in the army. He's not in education and my mother, like I said, was in communication arts. (p. 11).

At the same time, Rita wanted to "improve the system." She had personally a good schooling experience; it was real easy, but she felt the urge to change things as she saw a lot of wasted time in schools. Rita appeared in the first interview as very determined to make changes, especially in curriculum. She criticized one of the units taught and suggested ways of improving it, but the action was limited to ideas and projects. In her actual teaching, she followed the curriculum pretty closely. She felt comfortable with guidelines. She also realized she was given a lot of freedom.

The interesting point is that Rita did not act differently from Carol and did much less innovations than Laurie. Rita was concerned about curriculum at the thought level and involved in classroom management at the action level. A few excerpts will show her basic goal and purpose in her teaching experience. Establishing authority and respect were major concerns:

> I'm just gradually trying to really establish my authority and I don't want to start an activity and have it get a little noisy and have to say OK, get back in your seats, this is over. (p. 69).

Rita did not do group activities or projects that did not fit the routine and customs of her unit as she did not want to risk mismanagement and disturbing other units in the area.

Her major expectation from the experience was to have good classroom management. It posed for her a challenge trying to have a warm rapport and yet not lose control:

> Rapport with students is that the students respect me as a teacher, look to me for guidance or information, feel comfortable with me, see that I am capable of teaching them. Control to me is being able to have a classroom that is attentive. (p. 19).

She would like, in her own future self-contained classroom, to allow choices and some freedom, but:

> the teacher has to be the guide. That is the only way you can protect yourself. Protect yourself from total chaos. Protect yourself from the administration. Protect yourself so you are not totally overwhelmed. Just trying to make sure children are doing their tasks even though they are working at what they want to do because you do have guidelines to follow. Protect yourself from principal, parents too. In that sense, I mean, protect yourself from those outside forces but try to allow the students as many freedoms. (p. 62).

Accountability, self-protection, maintaining teaching identity, authority, and control were deeply ingrained in Rita's perspectives and her perception of success.

When asked about influences and important events in her desire to become a teacher, Rita remembered her third grade teacher. She didn't know why that teacher stands out in her memory as having had great impact. When talking about her with affection, Rita said she was

> Kind of authoritarian in her classroom; the class was very well-behaved and she did a couple of disciplinary actions that I, am totally against but that was many years ago when that type, you know, standing in the corner, sticking our heads in cubby holes...for some reason, that year is the one that really sticks in my mind that I really learned a lot and, I think, maybe that strictness was good in a sense. She had a lot of control over her class, and I seem to learn a lot from that class and...It's so long that I can't remember why she was the one who really influenced me. (pp. 6-7).

During the student teaching experience Rita looked very positively at supervisor and cooperating teacher as sources of help and influence. She did not feel the same about the university education program. She saw it as remote and idealistic and not having any impact on her teaching abilities. The only positive aspect of the program was the practical part in the schools. She wanted more time in schools.

> I actually have probably not used a whole heck of a lot that I got from the university. Simply because a lot of university theories and ideas are too idealistic and they're not practical when you're actually out there teaching. And I've talked to many people that feel this way. You take all this course work at the university and then you come into the classroom and it doesn't do you a bit of good. And you come in and you push it to the side and you develop your own thing...and you can't go along this ideal track that often the university exports to you. (p. 110).

> The biggest experience, or the most valuable experience is actually in the classroom, the two practicums that I've had, prior to student teaching...I can see myself growing from each one of those, and that's far more valuable than all the projects I did, and reading I did, and things like that." (p. 111).

It is important to remember that Rita's main emphasis was on classroom management (when choosing a topic for seminar presentation, she

researched discipline). When asked what changes had happened to her that semester, discipline was again a major theme.

> R: The changes I've made have been behavioral. I came in here with a fear of, like a behavioral modification type thing. And I've established now a way of dealing with kids and having them do what I want them to do and getting them motivated and dealing with discipline problems in the classroom.
>
> I: What does that have to do with behavior modification?
>
> R: Well, in so far as discipline, you know, modifying their behavior so they're behaving within the classroom, and that's all part of discipline. (p. 98).

Rita was task oriented; she wanted to see results. Her pragmatism fitted into the school's technical view of education. She was the only one of the three students who would use the school's technical jargon: competency, behavior modification, testing, packs, achievement, grouping.

The other change expressed by Rita was related to her views on kids. She had criticized at the beginning of the semester the distance that existed in the unit between teachers and students. She was referring to a rule in the unit whereby students were not allowed to get close to the teachers' desks. Now she resigned herself to thinking skeptically:

> You don't like to think that there are some bad kids; and I think there really are. There are kids that don't want to be in the classroom and I think I've resigned myself to that fact and now I have to deal with trying to motivate these children. You can't be so idealistic to think that children will enjoy school all the time and really want to be there. So you've got to try to develop things that you can motivate them, and hopefully get them to leave your class with a better attitude about school. (p. 99).

Rita had initially wanted to be more at the level with the kids but in her unit it seemed difficult and she was afraid to lose control:

> You take a step down on your authority and that's a risky thing...Smiling used to be a problem with me simply because I think I was a little tense. But the more comfortable I am in a situation, I have very little difficulty smiling. (p. 122).

The changes in Rita were in accordance with her expectations. She came into the experience with classroom management concerns and she focused her effort on discipline. She needed to feel in control so as to gain self-confidence. It was a reassuring experience. Her Teacher Beliefs Inventory scores show a change towards more humanistic teacher-pupil relationships (see Tables 1 and 2). The experience of control allowed her to think in less custodial ways of interacting with kids. Although it is important to note that the change in thought is not sufficient to understand perspectives. Thought and actions are in constant interplay. And, in Rita's case, it is more apparent as thoughts and actions were not very consistent and she was not willing to scrutinize her experiences.

Rita's reactions to her involvement with this research changed through the semester. She was enthusiastic at the beginning, spending time, initiating issues and volunteering information. As the interviews became probing and specific, relating actions and thoughts, observations and comments, Rita became less willing to participate. She gave less time and felt burdened by the questions. When given a copy of the first transcribed interview, Rita was negative and felt it did not make sense. It seemed as if the reflective aspect of the research was bothering her and she felt unmotivated to proceed in introspection.

A Case Survey of Developing Perspectives Towards Teaching

The comparisons and contrasts between Carol, Laurie, and Rita offer interesting insights in understanding the act of becoming teachers. A strong sense of uniqueness is present in each experience, although they all practiced in the same school and followed the same teacher education program. Everyone of the students expressed a growth process. Although the growth in these cases did not necessarily mean a change in perspectives, the process was not neither one dimensional, namely, learning the teaching act, nor cumulative--knowing how to teach better. Carol, Laurie, and Rita have expressed multifaceted ways of being influenced and changed. These ways were often suble occurrences or sometimes dramatic events.

Five major points will be made in concluding this paper; the purpose is to further the analysis and reflection in understanding and interviewing in the teaching development dynamics:

First, what we expected to be similar in actions and perspectives between Carol, Laurie, and Rita was not really similar. The identification of a common experience in terms of the same school and instructional team as well as the same university education program does not identify the phenomenon as experienced by the students as similar. There were similarities but these do not explain the differences in how each student constructed meaning from them. The routine of teaching was similar across the three cases. The three of them expressed a feeling of technical know how. They learned it in a cumulative style, increasing

their familiarity with the classroom practices. The student-teaching experience was not similar as one might expect. Their actions were similar: they all conformed to the school's regulations, but they did not necessarily develop similar views of teaching. Their reactions were not different for the observer's eye. They all three conformed but for different reasons. Although the external responses to the environment were behaviorally similar, the expectations and priorities were different. Each had her own style of putting the pieces together.

Rita and Carol adjusted to the school's style of teaching and used the same materials and techniques as the rest of the team in that unit. As to Laurie, she also behaved similarly as she monitored math packs and made sure that the kids went through the materials before the post test examinations. All three students were exposed to similar (action) constraints but the reactions (thought) were different; Carol followed regulations for awhile but she knew that was not what she would do in her classroom and even with her own kids, she was not as strict as her cooperating teacher wanted her to be. Rita adjusted but she also found techniques and regulations helpful for classroom management, and for establishing her authority. These were goals she pursued and felt good about. As to Laurie, she rebelled, she fell flat on her face, she then conformed and tried to make cooperating teacher and supervisor believe that she was changing her views.

The reasons behind the similar behaviors were very varied. The acquired skills were not conducive to shaping a way of thinking, but rather as a form of adjustment and situational survival. The contrast

between action and thought can become in some of the cases, a constant dilemma. The synthesis is an ongoing process, perspectives are constantly tested under differing circumstances. And student teachers more so than other teachers, have an immediate need to resolve the dilemma between actions and thoughts. As they work for others and in others' classrooms, they seem to act similarly: adopting conforming behaviors, when they really don't.

Second, what seems to explain the differences in their perspectives towards teaching is not explained by psychological factors, personal background, or environmental settings. The meaning and the personal interpretations of similar experiences that each student made are not only a product of the interaction between psychology and environment. What seems to clarify the students' teaching perspectives are the events--those key experiences--some tacit and quasi-imperceptibles and others dramatic and devastating.

Specific events or people (not the ones we expect to be influential) helped shape their thinking. In the case of Carol, the sources of impact were not the cooperating teacher, the supervisor, the school or the university education program. It was her 4th grade teacher, her leaving home, her new style of life at college, a friend who explained cars, the kids, and the research oppo tunities to reflect on her experiences. In the case of Laurie, the following episodes were salient: her car accident, her living in a liberal college environment, her boyfriends, her falling flat on her face when bringing innovation into the classroom, and the research opportunities to think back and introspect. In the case

of Rita; the school, cooperating teacher, and supervisor were strong influences. Her background was important in terms of what was successful: "establishing an authority figure." The events were not as evident as in the cases of Laurie and Carol, but Rita fits perfectly in the interactive literature view whereby background, biography, and ecology interact smoothly to form and shape views. It should be noted, however, that Rita was less willing to share views as the semester went by. There may have been salient occurrences, but Rita was unaware of them or did not want to talk about them. From these cases, it seems that upbringing, personality, and environmental factors were all backgrounds or the framework in which key experiences became shaping forces.

Third, the cases draw attention to the importance of the individual's interpretations of experiences. The results of this study could have been very different and misleading if they would have been based on observing the actions and analyzing the pre-post test scores.

In the three cases, a look at the Teacher Belief Inventory (see Tables 1 and 2) shows Carol as the person who changed most and Laurie as the one who was untouched by the experience. Basing the findings on pre-post test results would have missed the richness of Laurie's experience--the conflicts and resolutions. On the other hand, if the study had been limited to observations of behaviors, Carol's internal struggle and development would not have been apparent.

Observations and pre-post test studies alone lack information and power to analyze and understand the dynamics of growth. They are

incomplete in picturing the person's formation of perspectives and the implementation in the classroom of views and ideas. It is important to offer subjects the opportunity for the discussion of their views. It is also interesting to have others (as in this study; supervisor, and cooperating teacher), express their version of the story. Education needs more indepth case studies that use varied and complementary sources of information. It is essential to illuminate the phenomenon rather than to obscure it with irrelevant, incomplete, or disconnected pieces of information.

Fourth, the reflective process itself--opportunities for discussion by the student teacher with someone they can trust--was important to the development of perspectives. Involving the students in the process of inquiry made them researchers of their own perspectives.

Two of the three student teachers engaged fully in the activity and pursued it as a means to clarify issues, look back at experiences, and saw it as a challenge to think about questions they would not ask themselves readily and spontaneously. Carol felt that the research forced her to think about difficult or unresolved issues. It allowed her to go beyond the evident. The interviews helped Laurie express her struggles, look back analytically, and reconfirm her views and commitment to teaching. The research allowed them to make public their thinking. At the same point, the research process showed that not all students are willing to go through that analysis. The research process showed also that the teacher education program as it is conceived does not offer those reflection opportunities. Assessment and recommendations

from cooperating teacher and supervisor, stand in the way of trust and openness in the sharing of ideas. Teacher education programs need to find ways of facilitating that reflection. Supervisors and cooperating teachers are not always in a position to offer that challenge as they are tied into the evaluation process. All three students saw the seminars as the place for reflection and they saw their fellow students as best sources for interesting discussion.

Fifth, there is little focus on the development of perspectives in student teaching. Students seem to have no problems learning the teaching skills. Most education programs offer students cumulative opportunities to practice in different classrooms and to gain confidence in management techniques. The missing part is the development of perspectives.

Supervisors are too busy observing the actual teaching, suggesting techniques of improvement, and finally, qualifying the student for certification. Even when supervisors challenge students with reflective issues, the problem of trust is not always resolved. Student teachers are individuals and need to be treated as such. The dialogue for the development of perspectives is not easy. It will only happen if both parties are willing to engage in open introspection and continuing dialogue.

The development of perspectives is also missing, not only because of lacking opportunities, but because of the nature of the student-teaching experience itself. The three student teachers were attempting to form personal syntheses, but they often spoke of their views as

temporary and contingent to the situation. They had difficulties reconciling the inconsistencies between action and thoughts, between ideal and real, between personal and school goals. The resolution of dilemmas was not real, it was not even a compromise, but often expressed itself in conformist behavior. Studying student teachers' perspectives demands a follow-up of these students and an indepth longitudinal investigation. The student teachers do not really form perspectives but gather experiences that will attempt to give meaning to actions.

Student teaching is more a time to probe perspectives rather than to form them. Teachers in alternative styles of teaching often say "It took me many years before I was able to change and try these ideas." Other teachers left teaching to be able to explain and understand what they were trying to do. Time and distance, episodes and events, and varied environments are needed to speak of a teaching identity reflecting congruent perspectives. The cases in this study were vivid examples drawing attention towards the power of the individual in giving meaning to experiences.

Table 1

Pre and Post Tests Results from Teacher Beliefs Inventory (TBI)

1 Strongly Disagree — 2 Disagree — 3 Agree — 4 Strongly Agree

Students	Commitment to change Public Schools		Humanistic Teacher-Pupil Relationship		Active Teacher Role		Community Involvement in Schools		Weak Knowledge Frame		Questionning School and Society	
	Min-Max 2-8		Min-Max 8-32		Min-Max 8-32		Min-Max 6-12		Min-Max 9-36		Min-Max 4-16	
	Jan.	May	Jan.	May	Jan.	May	Jan.	May	Jan.	May	Jan.	May
Carol	3	6	24	27	19	24	22	22	33	33	10	12
Laurie	6	6	22	22	23	25	19	19	28	28	14	12
Rita	5	6	16	21	22	25	13	12	26	28	8	13

Table 2

Sample Item Results from Teacher Beliefs Inventory (TBI)

1 Strongly Disagree — 2 Disagree — 3 Agree — 4 Strongly Agree

	TBI sample items by categories[1]	Laurie Pre	Laurie Post	Carol Pre	Carol Post	Rita Pre	Rita Post
Commitment to Change Schools	• Public schools are doing a good job (3)	2	2	3	2	3	3
	• A great deal is wrong with public schools. Will contribute to reform . . . (50)	3	3	1	3	3	4
Humanistic Teacher-Pupil Relationship	• Teacher should start year as strict disciplinarian (4)	---	3	3	2	4	3
	• Teachers should tell students a great deal about themselves (31)	3	3	2	3	2	3
Teacher Role Autonomy	• Teachers should be left free to determine methods of instruction (28)	3	3	1	3	3	3
	• A teacher's primary task is to carry out the educational goals . . . formulated by others (33)	3	2.5	3	2	2	2
Questionning School and Society	• Schooling . . . helps perpetuate social and economic inequalities in our society (38)	3	3	2	3	2	2
	• Teachers should be concerned to change society (43)	3	2.5	2	2	2	3

[1]The other categories are not included as the students did not make any changes in community, knowledge and curriculum categories.

NOTES

1. Tabachnick, B.R., Zeichner, K., Adler, S., Densmore, K., & Egan, B.K. The development of teacher perspectives and the relationships among teacher perspectives, school and classroom processes, and student diversity. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling (in progress).

2. Tabachnick, B.R., & Zeichner, K. Research proposal funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-81-009) through the Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

REFERENCES

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. New York: Methuen, 1981.

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E., & Amarel, M. Beyond surface curriculum: An interview study of teachers' understanding. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1976.

Copeland, W. Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. Theory into Practice, 1980, 18, 194-199.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. Classroom ecology: Some concerns about a neglected dimension of research on teaching. Contemporary Education, 1975, 46, 183-188.

Elliot, J. The Cambridge accountability project. Cambridge Journal of Education, 1981, 2(2), 146-166.

Feiman, S. Growth and reflection as aims in teacher education. Paper prepared for a national conference: Exploring Issues in Teacher Education, Austin, Texas, January 1979.

Fox, G.T., Jr. The dynamic nature of teacher professional development. Paper presented at the AERA Conference, New York, April 1977.

Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1981, 12(1), 51-70.

Hammersley, M. Teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, 1977.

Iannacone, L. Student teaching: A transitional stage in the making of a teacher. Theory into Practice, 1963, 2, 73-80.

Klausmeier, H.J., Rossmiller, R.A., & Saily, M. (Eds.). Individually guided elementary education. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Lacey, C. The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen, 1977.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. The structure of educational organizations. In M. Meyer (Ed.), Environments and education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1978.

Stake, R.E. The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researcher, 1978, 7, 5-8.

Stenhouse, L. Case study and case records: Towards a contemporary history of education. British Educational Research Journal, 1978, 4(2).

Tabachnick, B., Popkewitz, T., & Zeichner, K. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 1979-80, 10, 12-29.

Tabachnick, B. Intern-teacher roles: Illusion, disillusion and reality. Journal of Education, April 1980, pp. 122-137.

Wehlage, G.G. Can teachers be more reflective about their work? A commentary on some research about teachers. Soviet-American Seminar on Teaching and Learning, Moscow, 1978.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 253-293.

Zeichner, K., & Grant, C. Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1981, 7, 298-314.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B.R. Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experiences. Journal of Teacher Education, May-June 1981, 32(7).